

Application No.: 09/529032

Case No.: 57174US006

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1-5, 8-14 and 17-29 are rejected. Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 are objected to. Claims 5, 6, 15 and 30-38 are hereby canceled. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 16 are hereby amended.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 6 and intervening claim 5 and have amended independent claim 14 to include the limitations of claim 15.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (cited in the previous Office Action) in view of McHugh (cited in the previous Office Action).

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 5 and 6 and independent claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is moot.

Claims 5, 8, 14, 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al/McHugh, as discussed above, further in view of Chen et al. (US 5,421,737).

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 5 and 6 and independent claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is moot.

Application No.: 09/529032Case No.: 57174US006

Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al./McHugh, as discussed above, further in view of Cho. (US 6,091,831).

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 5 and 6 and independent claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is moot.

Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al./McHugh/Chen et al., as discussed above, further in view of Cho.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 5 and 6 and independent claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is moot.

In addition to the foregoing arguments, Applicant(s) submit that a dependent claim should be considered allowable when its parent claim is allowed. *In re McCairn*, 1012 USPQ 411 (CCPA 1954). Accordingly, provided the independent claims are allowed, all claims depending therefrom should also be allowed.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Examination and reconsideration of the claims are requested. Allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant(s)' attorney if the Examiner believes any remaining questions or issues could be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

July 19, 2005
Date

By: Melanie Gover
Melanie G. Gover, Reg. No.: 41,793
Telephone No.: (512) 984-4308

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833